



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/014,362	12/11/2001	Masaki Kyojima	J355-037 US	1127
21706	7590	10/12/2005	EXAMINER	
NOTARO AND MICHALOS 100 DUTCH HILL ROAD SUITE 110 ORANGEBURG, NY 10962-2100			PHILLIPS, HASSAN A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2151	

DATE MAILED: 10/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/014,362

Applicant(s)

KYOJIMA ET AL.

Examiner

Hassan Phillips

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2005.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 9, 11, 13, 16, 17 and 22-26 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 9, 11, 13, 16, 17 and 22-26 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/11/05.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

RD

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to communications filed on July 28, 2005.

#### ***Priority***

2. The Examiner has received the certified copy of the P2001-3603 application, filed July 28, 2005.

#### ***Specification***

3. The correction to the title of the application, and the new format applied to the application, has been acknowledged. Accordingly, the objections to the specification have been withdrawn.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed July 28, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argued that Uskela does not teach or suggest an operation, which is unique to the client. Examiner respectfully submits that Applicant has misinterpreted the prior art of record.

Regarding Applicant's arguments, Uskela teaches the client performing a decryption involving a key pair for the client, (col. 5, lines 25-32, col. 4, lines 16-45). This operation is unique to the client because the key pair includes a secret key that uniquely identifies the client, (col. 4, lines 25-30, col. 3, lines 31-56, col. 1, line 65-col. 2, line 16).

Accordingly the references supplied by the examiner in the previous office action covers the claimed limitations. The rejections are thus sustained. Applicant is requested to review the prior art of record for further consideration.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) The invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1, 13, 16, 17, 22-26, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Uskela, U.S. Patent 6,721,886.

7. In considering claim 1, Uskela teaches a server that provides service to a client comprising: a public-key storage unit for storing a public key assigned to each service, (col. 5, lines 6-16); a challenge generator for generating a challenge to be sent from the server to the client after the server receives a request for the service from the client, (col. 5, lines 20-32); and an access privilege verifier for verifying, using a corresponding public key, whether a prescribed relationship exists between the challenge and a response to that challenge received from the client, (col. 5, lines 20-

Art Unit: 2151

34); wherein the response is calculated based on a unique operation for the client and access privilege proving that data is created from a private key corresponding to the public key, (col. 5, lines 25-36).

8. In considering claim 13, Uskela teaches a server that provides services to clients connected to the server via a network, the server comprising: a script interpreter for interpreting script designed to control the contents of the service, (col. 4, lines 46-55).

9. In considering claim 16, Uskela teaches a method executed in a server for providing service to a client wherein a public key is assigned in advance to a service provided by the server, the method comprising the steps of: generating a challenge when a request for the service is received from the client, (col. 5, lines 20-32); transmitting the challenge to the client, (col. 5, lines 20-32); receiving a response to the challenge from the client, (col. 5, lines 20-32); verifying whether a prescribed relationship exists between the challenge and the response by using the public key assigned to the requested service, (col. 5, lines 32-34); and providing the requested service to the client only when the prescribed relationship exists, wherein the response is calculated based on a unique operation for the client and a private key corresponding to the public key, (col. 5, lines 25-36).

10. In considering claim 17, Uskela teaches a method executed in a client for requesting service to a server, the method comprising the steps of: receiving a challenge from the server, (col. 5, lines 20-32); executing a unique operation assigned to the client wherein the unique operation is unique to the client, (col. 5, lines 25-36); generating a response based on the challenge received from the server, the result of the unique operation, and transmitting the response to the server, (col. 5, lines 20-32).

11. In considering claim 22, Uskela teaches a system comprising: a server that provides service to a client, (col. 4, line 46-col. 5, line 36); a public-key storage unit that stores a public key assigned to the service, (col. 5, lines 6-16); a challenge generator that generates a challenge to be sent from the server to the client after the server receives a request for the service from the client, (col. 5, lines 20-32); an access privilege verifier that verifies whether a prescribed relationship exists between the challenge and a response, the response being corresponding to the challenge and received from the client, and the client that requests the service to the server, (col. 5, lines 20-34); the client further comprising: a unique operation executor that executes unique operations assigned to the client, (col. 3, lines 31-56, col. 5, lines 25-36); a response generator that generates the response to the challenge, the challenge being received from the server, wherein the response is calculated based on the unique operation and a private key corresponding to the public key, and the unique operation is unique to the client, (col. 5, lines 20-36).

12. In considering claim 23, Uskela teaches the server sending the challenge to the client with a condition for using the service, (col. 5, lines 20-36).

13. In considering claim 24, Uskela teaches the unique operation is used under conditions that a common cryptographic hash function is assigned to all clients (col. 5, lines 25-32, col. 4, lines 16-45) and different data is assigned to each client, (col. 4, lines 25-30, col. 3, lines 31-56, col. 1, line 65-col. 2, line 16).

14. In considering claim 25, Uskela teaches a client that requests service to a server, comprising: a unique operation executor that executes unique operations assigned to the client, (col. 3, lines 31-56, col. 5, lines 25-36); an access privilege providing data storage unit that access privilege providing data, the access privilege providing data being created from a private key corresponding to a public key assigned to the requested service and a result of the unique operation, (col. 5, lines 25-36); a response generator that generates a response to a challenge, the challenge being received from the server, and wherein the response is calculated based on the result of the unique operation and the access privilege providing data, and the unique operation is unique to the client, (col. 5, lines 20-36).

15. In considering claim 26, Uskela teaches the access privilege providing data storage unit included in a portable device, (col. 5, lines 25-36).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claims 9, 11, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uskela in view of Brown, U.S. Patent 6,487,667.

18. In considering claims 9 and 11, although the teachings of Uskela disclose substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to explicitly teach the server being a web server.

Nevertheless, web servers were well known in the art at the time of the present invention. In a similar field of endeavor, Brown teaches a challenge-response technique that utilizes keys corresponding to web servers in granting access to the web servers, (col. 3, lines 29-65).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to modify the teachings of Uskela to show the server being a web server, and the public key assigned to individual an individual web page, or groups of web pages provided to the client. This would have provided a reliable means for authenticating a client before allowing the client to view individual web pages, or groups of web pages, Uskela, col. 1, line 5 through col. 2, line 16.



***Conclusion***

**19. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

**20.** Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hassan Phillips whose telephone number is (571) 272-3940. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HP/  
10/7/05

  
**ZARNI MAUNG**  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER